

REMARKS

Claims 19 and 20 were objected to because claim 19 recites the limitation “configured camera” in line 3 of the claim. The Examiner indicated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, and that claim 20 falls with its parent claim 19.

By this amendment, claim 19 has been changed to depend on claim 17. Accordingly, this change should remove the Examiner’s objection to claims 19 and 20.

Claims 1-16 and 23-26 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiota et al. (US 6,324,521).

By this amendment, claim 1 has been changed to more clearly set forth the present invention. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that the method is directed to configuring a photographic film product, wherein the photographic film product includes undeveloped photographic film capable of taking photographs of scenes. The method set forth in amended claim 1 includes configuring the photographic film product to include the uploaded digital image by using the uploaded digital image to pre-expose a latent image on at least one frame of the undeveloped photographic film, and sending the configured photographic film product to a designee of the purchaser so that the configured photographic film product can be used to take photographs of scenes.

Shiota et al. fail to disclose or suggest these features set forth in amended claim 1. In particular, Shiota et al. do not teach configuring photographic film product to include an uploaded digital image by using the uploaded digital image to pre-expose a latent image on at least one frame of the undeveloped photographic film, and then sending the configured photographic film product to a designee of the purchaser so that the configured photographic film product can be used to take photographs of scenes. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Shiota et al.

Claims 3-6 depend on amended claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over the prior art at least due to their dependency on amended claim 1.

By this amendment, claims 2, 7-16 and 23-26 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2, 7-16 and 23-26 under 35 USC 102(e) is believed to be moot.

Claims 17-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (US 5,696,965) in view of Arnold (US 5,758,216).

By this amendment, claim 17 has been changed to more clearly set forth the present invention. More specifically, claim 17 has been amended to particularly point out that the method is directed to configuring one-time use cameras to customize such cameras, wherein the one-time use cameras include photographic film. The method set forth in amended claim 17 includes configuring the camera to include the uploaded digital image by using the uploaded digital image to pre-expose a latent image on at least one frame of the photographic film, and sending the configured camera to a designee of the purchaser so that the configured camera can be used to take photographs of scenes.

Neither prior art reference cited by the Examiner, taken singly or in combination, discloses or suggests these features set forth in amended claim 17. As the Examiner points out, Dedrick fails to teach a purchaser uploading at least one digital image from the purchaser's location remote from the electronic database. In addition, Dedrick fails to teach configuring a one-time use camera to include the uploaded digital image by using the uploaded digital image to pre-expose a latent image on at least one frame of the photographic film, and then sending the configured camera to a designee of the purchaser so that the configured camera can be used to take photographs of scenes, as set forth in amended claim 17.

Moreover, Arnold fails to satisfy the deficiencies found in Dedrick described above. As the Examiner points out, Arnold teaches a filmstrip being pre-recorded information which can be read out by a photofinisher and employed in the processing of the filmstrip and completion of a customer order in accordance with promotional information appearing on the external package. However, Arnold fails to disclose or suggest a purchaser uploading at least one digital image from the purchaser's location remote from the electronic database. Further, Arnold does not disclose or suggest configuring a one-time use camera to include the uploaded digital

image by using the uploaded digital image to pre-expose a latent image on at least one frame of the photographic film, and sending the configured camera to a designee of the purchaser so that the configured camera can be used to take photographs of scenes. Thus, even assuming that Dedrick and Arnold could be combined, such combination of references still does not teach or suggest the invention set forth in amended claim 17. Accordingly, it is submitted that the invention of amended claim 17 distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-22 depend on amended claim 17 and are believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on amended claim 17. Claim 18 has been cancelled, and therefore, the rejection of claim 18 under 103(a) is believed to be moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, Applicant's attorney would appreciate a telephone call to attend to these matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.
A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela R. Crocker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,447

PRC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 477-0553
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646

Enclosures: Letter to Draftsperson
Copies of Formal Drawings